## AGENCY ESTIMATE

OF THE FISCAL IMPACT OF IMPLEMENTING

# Bill Number HB 40 2011 General Session

Bonding Requirements for Government Officers and Employees

Sponsor: Rep. Ryan Wilcox Lead Analyst: Ben Leishman

Agency Contact: Von Hortin Title: Auditor IV

Agency Utah State Office of Education Office: 801-538-7670 Cell: 801-520-6859

#### A. Short Form (For bills that have no impact on the state, local governments, businesses, or individuals.)

If you can check all five boxes to the right, you're almost done. If the bill obviously doesn't have an impact, you're done.

If it isn't so obvious, explain what's going on. The most usual explanation is the codification of existing practices.

Attachments welcome.

- X State agencies will not require an appropriation to implement the bill.
- There is no fiscal impact on local governments.
- X There is no fiscal impact on businesses
- X There is no fiscal impact on individuals.
- X The bill will not affect revenues.

If necessary, explain why this bill has no fiscal impact.

This bill would decrease the amounts being paid for fidelity bonds, therefore decreasing costs.

#### B. What parts of the bill cause fiscal impact?

Cite specific sections or line numbers.

For Education lines 262, 265-267 would decrease the requirement to purchase fidelity bonds separate from what is already included in state risk management coverage already in place.

### C. Which program gets the appropriation?

Enter 3 letter Appropriation Unit Code.

For m	ıultıpl	e ap	propri	ations
This is		of		

## D. Work Notes: Assumptions, calculations & what are we buying?

Explain the fiscal impact in plain English, detailing your assumptions, methods, & calculations.

List all direct costs. Identify one-time and ongoing costs. Detail FTE impacts.

Do not say, "\$50,000 in Current Expense." Be very specific about what this \$50,000 will buy.

Attachments encouraged.

Lines 262, 265-267 would decrease the requirement to purchase bonds for certain education employees. Reducing the requirement would decrease the costs and thereby save money instead of creating additional costs.

It is assumed that all claims made under this area of the law wouls be smaller than the \$10 million the state risk management already covers for insured districts and charter schools.

For 41 districts with an estimated average of \$1,000 per year in cost is \$41,000 per year in Education.

E. REVENUES					
Select Fund		Current Budget Year FY 2011		Coming Budget Year FY 2012	Future Budget Year FY 2013
Local Revenue				(41,000)	(41,000)
Property Tax					
Uniform School Fund					
	Total	0	_	(41,000)	(41,000)
	•				

F. COSTS by FUN Select Fund		urrent Budget Year FY 2011	Coming Budget Year FY 2012	Future Budget Year FY 2013
Local Revenue Property Tax			(41,000)	(41,000)
Uniform School Fund	Total	0	(41,000)	(41,000)

G. COSTS by EXPENDITURE CATEGORY.				
Expenses by Category	Current Budget Year FY 2011	Coming Budget Year FY 2012	Future Budget Year FY 2013	
Personal Services				
Travel				
Current Expense		(41,000)	(41,000)	
DP Current Expense				
DP Capital Outlay				
Capital Outlay				
Other/Pass Thru				
Total	0	(41,000)	(41,000)	
-				

H. Non-State Impacts Your estimate of how will the bill affect:				
Local Governments	I was not able to figure the impacts on other local governments beyond school districts and charter schools.			
Businesses	No substantial impact.			
Individuals	No substantial impact.			
2010 Version 11.09				
This is a draft fiscal note response from the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and may be revised in the future.  Attachments welcome.				